

**REMARKS**

In the present Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to delete "a vapor or a gas" mixture. Claim 11 has been amended to change its dependency to claim 1. Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 3, 5, 13 and 24 have been amended to further improve their form. Claims 6 and 8 were previously canceled. No new matter has been added.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-5, 7 and 11-36 will be all the claims pending in the application.

**I. Statement of Substance of Interview**

Applicants thank Examiners Altrev Sykes and Larry Tarazano for their participation in a telephonic Interview on August 5, 2010. The Interview Summary dated August 16, 2010 reflects the substance of the interview.

**II. Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are in compliance with the § 112 requirements.

As noted above, claim 1, from which claims 2-5, 7 and 9-36 depend, has been amended to delete "a vapor or a gas" mixture. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

**III. Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

a. Claims 1-5, 7, 10-16, 18 and 26-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,093,197 to Howard et al. in view of WO 93/12868.

**b.** Claims 17 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al. in view of the "EPA Technical Bulletin on Zeolite," the EPA Technical Bulletin.

**c.** Claims 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,786,428 to Arnold et al.

**d.** Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,493,497 to Pretorius et al.

**e.** Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,943 to Koenhen.

**f.** Claims 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,344,177 to Hensley et al.

**g.** Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Howard et al., in view of WO 00/02638 to Boggs et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

In the Amendment, claim 1, from which claims 2-5, 7 and 11-36 depend, has been amended to recite a controlled flow of a liquid mixture comprising a solvent and a non-solvent for the polymeric material, which was recited in previous claim 9. The Office Action states that claim 9 is allowable (paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Office Action). Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 18, 2010

By:

  
Fang Liu, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 51283

**Customer No. 21839**

703 836 6620